



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,670	01/16/2002	Michael Raley	111325-44	2328
22204	7590	08/10/2005	EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128			DADA, BEEMNET W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,670

Applicant(s)

RALEY ET AL.

Examiner

Beemnet W. Dada

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-75 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Downs et al US Patent 6,574,609 (hereinafter Downs).

4. As per claim 1, Downs teaches a system for distributing digital documents having usage rights associated therewith, said system comprising:

a server having at least one digital document stored thereon (i.e., content providers or digital content stores) [column 10, lines 5-17 and 28-42];

a client computer having a standard application program including a rendering engine capable of being accessed to render content (i.e., end-user devices) [column 11, lines 54-column 12, line 10];

a communications network coupled to said client and said server [column lines 11-17];
and

a security module adapted to be attached to the standard application program for enforcing security conditions for accessing the rendering engine [column 22, lines 9-16, 60-67].

5. As per claims 2 and 3, Downs further teaches the system wherein the security conditions include usage rights associated with the content [column 22, lines 9-16, 60-67].

6. As per claims 4, 23-27 and 35-36, Downs further teaches wherein said security module is operative to determine if said client computer is missing any security component software based on a predetermined configuration required for managing security of requested content and if said at least one client unit is missing any security component software based on said predetermined configuration, said security module is operative to provide said missing security component software to said client computer [column 77, lines 17-37].

7. As per claims 5 and 32-34, Downs further teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to check the content to determine if requested content requires a client side component of said security module and to disengage the client side security component from the standard application if the requested content does not require a client side security component [column 78, lines 22-40 and column 77, lines 17-37].

8. As per claim 6, Downs further teaches the system wherein said server comprises plural server computers and said security module is operative to cause said client computer to exchange one or more keys with a first of said server computers to obtain a validation certificate, said validation certificate permitting said client computer to securely communicate with a second of said server computers without any further exchange of keys between said client computer and any of said server computers [column 77, lines 17-37].

9. As per claims 7 and 8, Downs teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to define a user interface of said standard application in accordance with parameters specified by said server [column 78, lines 7-21].

10. As per claims 9-11, Downs teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to superimpose a watermark based on client specific data on a image rendered by said rendering engine [column 79, lines 4-25].

11. As per claims 12-17, Downs teaches the system further comprising a transaction aggregator system for managing transactions relating to document distribution and wherein said security module comprises a server side security component that directs the client computer to the transaction aggregator to receive a client side security component in exchange for transmitting user information to the transaction aggregator when said client computer makes a request for content and when said client side security component is not installed in said client computer, and wherein said transaction aggregator validates said client computer, based on predetermined conditions, and wherein said client side security component is unique to thereby identify said client computer to said server and to permit said server to report information relating to transactions with said client side computer to said transaction aggregator [column 11, lines 7-37].

12. As per claim 18-19, Downs teaches the system wherein said server comprises a storage device containing a folder of embedded links to digital content and wherein the address of said folder is selected one of and to be difficult to ascertain, said security module being operative to provide information relating to at least one of the links when said client computer sends a

request for content to said server and said security module indicates that that said client computer is authorized to access the content [column 25, lines 27-38].

13. As per claims 20-22, Downs further teaches the system wherein said security module creates a document containing references to the digital content and spawns a child instance of the rendering engine to render the document, and wherein said child instance of said rendering engine is operative to follow the references to retrieve content through an asynchronous protocol from a secured location [column 25, lines 15-37].

14. As per claims 28 and 29, Downs further teaches the system wherein said security component embeds all security information in a header of a document transmitted between said client computer and said server, said document having a body that does not contain security information for content in the document [column 27, metadata information].

15. As per claim 30 and 31, Downs further teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to check a request made by said client computer at two stages, a first stage filter checks if said request corresponds to a prohibited URL and a second stage filter checks if said request corresponds to a prohibited directory, and wherein if said request corresponds to a prohibited URL, or if said request corresponds to a prohibited directory, then said request is denied by said server [column 78, lines 8-21].

16. As per claims 37-72, the claimed steps correspond to the functions of the elements of the system claims 1-36, which has been rejected above and thus rejected with the same reason applied thereto.

17. Claims 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Luckenbaugh et al. US Patent 6,311,269 B2 (hereinafter Luckenbaugh).

18. As per claims 73-75, Luckenbaugh teaches an HTML document adapted to be rendered by Web browser in a secure environment (figure 2B), said document comprising: an HTML header defined between header tags (figure 2B, step 233); an HTML body containing content (figure 2B, step 234); and security information (i.e., Cookie) embedded in said header [figure 2B, step 233].

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W. Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

August 6, 2005



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100